



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

on

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,516	01/03/2002	Tuan Bui	IDB-5775 (1417G P 645)	6007

7590 07/30/2003

Francis C.M. Kowalik, Esq.
Corporate Counsel, Law Department
BAXTER INTERNATIONAL INC.
One Baxter Parkway, DF2-2E
Deerfield, IL 60015

EXAMINER

GHAFOORIAN, ROZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3763	

3763

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/038,516	Applicant(s) BUI, TUAN
Examiner Roz Ghafloorian	Art Unit 3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,9,10,13-19,21,22,25-39 and 42-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11,12,20,23,24,40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group B in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that although the application contains 10 patently distinct species of invention, each group relates to a medial treatment apparatus and therefore there is not a serious burden on the Examiner to search 10 different distinct species. This is not found persuasive because as stated by the applicant the 10 Group as patently distinct and all require search and consideration, since the applicant has 10 distinct inventions in the application its is very unreasonable for the applicant to expect the examiner to give each and every one of the inventions (although related) her undivided attention.

Claims 3, 21-22, 18-19, 33-35, and 43-44 are also being removed from the application because they do not read on the elected Group B.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 3763

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-12, 20, 23-24, 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Pub No.2002/0126036 to Flaherty et al or US Patent Pub NO.2002/0143290 to Bui et al.

Both Bui and Flaherty teach a medical device having a supply of medication and a means for delivering the medication to the patient, a control algorithm coupled to the medical device, and a sensor coupled to a patient to receive information from the patient concerning the physiological condition of the patient, the information being transferred from the sensor to the control algorithm, wherein the control algorithm is adapted to process the information to control the delivery of the medication from the medical device to the patient based on the information that was processed.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-12, 20, 23-24, 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No.5885245 to Lynch et al or US Patent NO.5935099 to Peterson et al.

Art Unit: 3763

Both Peterson and Lynch teach a medical device having a supply of medication and a means for delivering the medication to the patient, a control algorithm coupled to the medical device, and a sensor coupled to a patient to receive information from the patient concerning the physiological condition of the patient, the information being transferred from the sensor to the control algorithm, wherein the control algorithm is adapted to process the information to control the delivery of the medication from the medical device to the patient based on the information that was processed.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-12, 20, 23-24, 40-41 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of copending Application No. 10039751. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the current application are simply a broader claim limitations than the claims in Application No. 1039751.

Art Unit: 3763


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roz Ghafoorian whose telephone number is 703-305-2336. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

RG
July 25, 2003


MICHAEL J. HAYES
PRIMARY EXAMINER